U.S. Department of Justice
Executive Office for Immigration Review

Decision of the Board of Immigration Appeals

Falls Church, Virginia 22041

*File: D2013-168 Date:

In re: MILTON L. MEYERS, Attorney

SEP 3 2013

IN PRACTITIONER DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS

FINAL ORDER OF DISCIPLINE

ON BEHALF OF DHS: Catherine M. O'Connell, Disciplinary Counsel

ON BEHALF OF EOIR: Jennifer J. Barnes, Disciplinary Counsel

The respondent will be suspended from practice before the Board, Immigration Courts, and Department of Homeland Security (the "DHS"), for two years.

On May 28, 2013, the Appellate Division of the Supreme Court of the State of New York, First Judicial Department, suspended the respondent from the practice of law in New York for two years. Consequently, the DHS initiated disciplinary proceedings against the respondent and on June 26, 2013, petitioned for the respondent's immediate suspension from practice before the DHS. The Disciplinary Counsel for the Executive Office for Immigration Review (EOIR) then asked that the respondent be similarly suspended from practice before EOIR, including the Board and Immigration Courts.

Therefore, on July 15, 2013, we suspended the respondent from practicing before the Board, the Immigration Courts, and the DHS pending final disposition of this proceeding.

The respondent was required to file a timely answer to the allegations contained in the Notice of Intent to Discipline. 8 C.F.R. § 1003.105 (2013); 8 C.F.R. § 292.3(e). The respondent's failure to file a response within the time period prescribed in the Notice constitutes an admission of the allegations therein, and the respondent is now precluded from requesting a hearing on the matter. 8 C.F.R. § 1003.105(2013); 8 C.F.R. § 292.3(e).

The Notice of Intent to Discipline proposes that the respondent be suspended from practice for two years before the DHS, and the Disciplinary Counsel for EOIR asks that we extend that discipline to practice before the Board and Immigration Courts as well. As the respondent failed to file a timely answer, the regulations direct us to adopt the proposed sanction contained in the Notice, unless there are considerations that compel us to digress from that proposal. 8 C.F.R. § 1003.105(2013); 8 C.F.R. § 292.3(e).

D2013-168

Since the proposed sanction is appropriate in light of the fact that respondent was suspended from the practice of law in New York, we will honor it. Accordingly, we hereby suspend the respondent from practice before the Board, the Immigration Courts, and the DHS, for two years. As the respondent is currently under our July 15, 2013, order of suspension, we will deem the respondent's suspension to have commenced on that date.

ORDER: The Board hereby suspends the respondent from practice before the Board, the Immigration Courts, and the DHS, for two years.

FURTHER ORDER: The respondent is instructed to maintain compliance with the directives set forth in our prior order. The respondent is also instructed to notify the Board of any further disciplinary action against him.

FURTHER ORDER: The respondent may petition this Board for reinstatement to practice before the Board, Immigration Courts, and DHS under 8 C.F.R.§ 1003.107(2013).

FURTHER ORDER: As the Board earlier imposed an immediate suspension order in this case, today's order of the Board becomes effective immediately. 8 C.F.R. § 1003.105(d)(2)(2013).

FOR THE BOARD